

Ducks,

PORT OF AMOY.

SHIP OWNERS, AGENTS, and COMMANDERS are informed that the COMPANY'S ESTABLISHMENTS at the above Port afford every facility, at moderate charges, for REPAIRING and SPARING VESSELS, and CLEANING AND PAINTING IRON SHIPS AND STEAMERS.

THEIR LARGE GRANITE DOCK, has 230 feet length of docks, and is 17 feet depth. They can receive Vessels of 100 tons.

CALISSE GATE, AND POWERFUL CENTRIFUGAL.

And an Engineers workshop fitted with Lathe Tools, driven by steam, Iron and Brass Foundries, Boiler-mills, ship-repairing and Carpentry, and ship-repairing sheds. All supervised by resident Engineers.

Their two smaller GRANITE DOCKS can receive, at spring tides, Vessels drawing 12 feet.

Spur, Timber, and other Dock-yards kept in stock.

Quarters for Officers, and a DRY GODOWNS for STORES, Vessels under repair, &c. to 2317 Amoy, December, 1868.

FOOD AND WOOD.

RIVER MIN.

THE above granite floored DOCK, of the following dimensions, viz.—length, 200 feet, breadth, 40 feet, is capable of receiving Vessels drawing 18 to 16 feet, as the water is 12 feet deep, and is 17 feet deep to the blocks and is topped out by steam.

WITNEY'S IRON SCREW CUTTING

COT.

DRILLING AND SCREWING MACHINES,

AND A BRITISH WORKSHOP.

LARGE Godowns on the premises for STOCKADE OF CARGO, &c., &c. A large Block of Woods, Metal, &c., &c., always on hand, and all kinds of iron to 500 tons, at current rates on application to JOHN C. GREY.

The list of charges for lighting or remounting Vessels can be obtained from Messrs. DE SILVER & CO., Hong Kong.

MADE LAKE, CRAWFORD & CO., Shanghai, 1st May.

The delivery of the Daily Press from the office commenced on Tuesday morning, 10th, and will commence on the office, 10th.

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, June 15th, 1870.

This letter which the Earl of CLAREY sent on the subject of Missionary labour in China, and which is reprinted from the Blue Book in another portion of to-day's paper, forms a very lucid exposition of this most important question. Whilst Bishop ALFRED is singularly temperate in the expressions which he uses, he is, at the same time, distinct in his views and logical in his arguments. He indicates with an astuteness that would do credit to a veteran diplomatist, the point at which an appeal to Pekin in respect to outrages on Missionaries is certain to prove useless. To appeal to Pekin is, in fact, as he observes, to abandon the cause; as it is certain to be construed by the local officials into an evidence of weakness, while there is no prospect of the matter being taken up in earnest by the Chinese.

The Daily Press of June 7th has the following:—The Agent of the Missionary Company has kindly forwarded to us the following letter received from the Committee of the Chinese Missionary Society:—

"I have the pleasure to send you a copy of a telegram which I have just received from our Agent in Canton, of 27th May—The Agent and Consul have both passed the Port of Canton to the outward French mail steamer, from Macao, to Hong Kong, and the Consul left this on the 26th April."

POLICE INTELLIGENCE.

BEIJING, June 15th.

Summary of police offences disposed of at the metropolis:—drunks, three; chair-throwers, two; horse-thieves, two; pickpockets, eight; and on the hillsides, one; fighting and creating a disturbance, two; ran a brothel, one; usury, one; and, using language, one; spectator of an execution, three.

CHINESE JURISDICTION.

BEIJING, June 15th.

Mr. HORNIGOLD, of G. & S. SILVER—\$20. His 1st desire that Mr. Hornigold was entitled to see on the boundary note, and gave him \$20 as his costs for that amount. Plaintiff will be at liberty to see every month for the remaining instalments.

A. GREGORY & P. R. POTTER—\$85.—This was a case of board, as supplied at the Sailor's Home. Defendant had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

W. SCHAFFER & CO.—\$38.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

W. SCHAFFER & CO.—\$38.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but he declined it, as he had been a mate, and had objections to serving before the court. For his refusal of a word, he was brought against him. Judgment for plaintiff.

J. G. WHITALL & CO.—\$100.—In September last the plaintiff in this case had a trial before the Court against the defendant, who had been indicted, but

